



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/644,468

08/20/2003

Eric S. Barnes

A3175-US-NP

5956

75931 7590 09/02/2010

BASCH & NICKERSON LLP
1777 PENFIELD ROAD
PENFIELD, NY 14526

EXAMINER

KASSA, HILINA S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/02/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

dmasters@bnpatentlaw.com
dneels@bnpatentlaw.com
mnickerson@bnpatentlaw.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/644,468
Filing Date: August 20, 2003
Appellant(s): BARNES ET AL.

Eric S. Barnes
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 06/18/2010 appealing from the Office action mailed 12/17/2009.

(1) Real Party in Interest

The examiner has no comment on the statement, or lack of statement, identifying by name the real party in interest in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The following is a list of claims that are rejected and pending in the application:

Claims 1, 2 and 8-33 are pending.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The examiner has no comment on the summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal. Every ground of rejection set forth in the Office action from which the appeal is taken (as modified by any advisory actions) is being maintained by the examiner except for the grounds of rejection (if any) listed under the subheading "WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS." New grounds of rejection (if any) are provided under the subheading "NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION."

(7) Claims Appendix

The examiner has no comment on the copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the appellant's brief.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,744,452	McBrearty et al.	07-2004
5,870,769	Freund	02-1999
2005/0223320	Brintzenhofe et al.	10-2005
2004/0141197	Gauthier	07-20004
2003/0086098 A1	Sesek et al.	05-2003

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1, 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brintzenhofe et al. (US Publication Number 2005/0223320 A1) in view of McBrearty et al. (US Patent Number 6,744,452 B1).

(1) regarding claim 1: As shown in figures 4A-8, Brintzenhofe et al. disclose, a method for creating reusable composite components from interpreted pages of a document to be rendered during dynamic document construction, each interpreted page having cacheable reusable document components and *non-cached document components*, (**paragraph [0011], lines 4-11; note that automatic integration, composition and layout of content from multiple sources into intelligent dynamic document templates**) comprising:

obtaining a list of document components associated with an interpreted page cacheable reusable, the list of document components including cacheable reusable document components and *non-cached document components associated with the interpreted page* (**paragraph [0086], lines 1-6; note that a composite document with different types of components is discloses see also figure 6**);

identifying the cacheable reusable document components included in the obtained list of documents components associated with the interpreted page (**paragraph [0086], lines 3-9; note that the cacheable reusable document is identified as the file**);

caching each identified cacheable reusable document components rendered to each identified cacheable reusable document component's respective bounding box dimensions (**130, figure 4A, paragraph [0100], lines 1-6; note that within the component there are subcomponents which also get rendered to fit content to layout as explained in paragraph [0111], lines 7-11**); and

caching a composite combination of a set of identified cacheable reusable document components rendered, relative to each identified cacheable reusable document component in the composite combination, in a bounding box of sufficient size to adequately contain the composite combination (**paragraph [0125], lines 1-8; note that the brochure composition has been rendered to media as a layout referring to figures 10-12 for the composition**);

Brintzenhofe et al. disclose most of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching obtaining a list of document components from said page and *identifying any non-cached components*.

However, McBrearty et al discloses obtaining a list of document components from said page and *non-cached document components associated with the interpreted page* (**figure 5, column 9, lines 28-34; note that a web page is requested or obtained from a server and a check is made to determine if non cached components are present**).

Brintzenhofe et al. and McBrearty et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skilled in the art to obtain a list of document components from said page and *non-cached document components associated with the interpreted page*. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been so that it would to efficiently improve a method for identifying cached web pages to a user (column 5, lines 4-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Brintzenhofe et al. with McBrearty et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim1.

(2) regarding claim 30: Brintzenhofe et al. disclosed the method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising: caching, to form a composite reusable underlay, a combination of identified cacheable reusable document components rendered **(paragraph [0133], lines 1-24; note that the design composition of the overall combination for figure 9 is thoroughly described forming a reusable underlay)**, relative to each identified cacheable reusable document component in the combination, to a full page size **(paragraph [0134], lines 1-8; note that the brochure composition gets rendered to full page size as also shown in figure 9 and it is also explained in paragraph [0135])**.

(3) regarding claim 31: Brintzenhofe et al. disclosed a method for creating reusable composite components from interpreted pages of a document to be rendered during dynamic document construction, each interpreted page having cacheable reusable document components and *non- cached components* **(paragraph [0011],**

lines 4-11; note that automatic integration, composition and layout of content from multiple sources into intelligent dynamic document templates), comprising:

obtaining a list of document components associated with an interpreted page cacheable reusable, the list of document components including cacheable reusable document components and *non-cached document components associated with the interpreted page* (**paragraph [0086], lines 1-6; note that a composite document with different types of components is discloses see also figure 6);**

identifying the cacheable reusable document components included in the obtained list of documents components associated with the interpreted page (**paragraph [0086], lines 3-9; note that the cacheable reusable document is identified as the file); and**

caching, to form a composite reusable underlay, a combination of identified cacheable reusable document components rendered (**paragraph [0125], lines 1-8; note that the brochure composition has been rendered to media as a layout referring to figures 10-12 for the composition), relative to each identified cacheable reusable document component in the combination, to a full page size (paragraph [0134], lines 1-8; note that the brochure composition gets rendered to full page size as also shown in figure 9 and it is also explained in paragraph [0135]).**

Brintzenhofe et al. disclose most of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching *non-cached document components associated with the interpreted page*.

However, McBrearty et al discloses *non-cached document components associated with the interpreted page* (**figure 5, column 9, lines 28-34; note that a web page is requested or obtained from a server and a check is made to determine if non cached components are present**).

Brintzenhofe et al. and McBrearty et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to have *non-cached document components associated with the interpreted page*. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been so that it would to efficiently improve a method for identifying cached web pages to a user (column 5, lines 4-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Brintzenhofe et al. with McBrearty et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 31.

(4) regarding claim 32: Brintzenhofe et al. disclosed the method as claimed in claim 31, further comprising: caching each identified cacheable reusable document component rendered to each identified cacheable reusable document component's respective bounding box dimensions (**paragraph [0134], lines 1-8; note that the brochure composition gets rendered to full page size as also shown in figure 9 and it is also explained in paragraph [0135]**).

(5) regarding claim 33: Brintzenhofe et al. disclosed the method as claimed in claim 31, further comprising: caching a composite combination of a set of identified cacheable reusable document components rendered (**130, figure 4A, paragraph**

[0100], lines 1-6; note that within the component there are subcomponents which also get rendered to fit content to layout as explained in paragraph [0111], lines 7-11), relative to each identified cacheable reusable document component in the composite combination, in a bounding box of sufficient size to adequately contain the composite combination (paragraph [0125], lines 1-8; note that the brochure composition has been rendered to media as a layout referring to figures 10-12 for the composition).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauthier (US Publication Number 2004/0141197 A1) in view of McBrearty et al. (US Patent Number 6,744,452 B1).

(1) regarding claim 2: Gauthier discloses a method for rendering pages having a combination of reusable components and non-cached components (**paragraph [0009]; lines 1-6; note that a variable data which enables the template and graphic state associated with multiple items of variable data from a database or merge file), comprising:**

searching a cache of reusable underlays for underlays having the reusable document components needed by the page (**paragraph [0009], lines 7-12; note that the once the variable data is stored the graphics states can be repeatedly applied to the items of variable data from multiple variable data bitmaps);**

if the correct reusable underlay is not found in cache then generating a composite reusable underlay from the reusable document components of said page and caching said RUL rendered to full page size (**paragraph [0046], lines 11-13; note that if the attributes of the current graphics state differs from the attributes of previously reserved graphics, the control task generates another font cache**);

creating a full page size overlay from the non-cached components that is retained until it is mated with the cached reusable underlay (**paragraph [0047], lines 1-5; note that once the template is complete, it incorporates all of the static text and graphic data that is to appear on the printed document**);

if the correct underlay is found in cache then retrieving the reusable underlay; and (**paragraph [0049], lines 7-13; note that the merger task accesses the merge file to retrieve the name of the template for the page and then retrieves the names of the data fields and reserved graphic states which are associated with the selected template from the merge file**)

rendering, along with the overlay, the page therefrom (**paragraph [0050], lines 1-5; note that the name corresponding to the first graphics state on the page, the merge accesses the merge file**).

Gauthier disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for assessing said rendered page for the possibility of having an underlay-overlay pair.

However, McBrearty et al. disclose assessing said rendered page for the possibility of having an underlay-overlay pair (**figure 5, column 9, lines 28-34; note**

Art Unit: 2625

that a web page is requested or obtained from a server and a check is made to determine if non cached components are present, per specification underlay-overlay implies cached and non-cached components, abs.).

Gauthier and McBrearty et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. presentation processing of document. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to assess said rendered page for the possibility of having an underlay-overlay pair. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been so that it would to efficiently improve a method for identifying cached web pages to a user (column 5, lines 4-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Brintzenhofe et al. with McBrearty et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

Claims 8-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauthier (US Publication Number 2004/0141197 A1) and of Brintzenhofe et al. (US Publication Number 2005/0223320 A1), further in view of Freund (US Patent Number 5,870,769).

(1) regarding claim 8: Gauthier discloses an apparatus for processing documents each represented by a document description encoded in a page description language supportive of reusable data (**paragraph [0009], lines 1-8; note that a method for utilizing variable data with a page description language**), comprising:

a page description language interpreter that receives the document description (paragraph [0023], lines 1-8; **note that an image containing text and graphics data is created a workstation**) an imager (12, figure 1), communicating with the interpreter (paragraph [0024], lines 1-3; **note that the generated file gets transferred to the printer**), that creates image representations of received document components (paragraph [0024], lines 3-4; **note that the postscript interpreter creates a page map of the image**); and

a reusable document component repository that stores image representations derived from a plurality of processed documents (28, figure 1; paragraph [0047], lines 1-6; **note that the template gets stored**), the reusable document component repository communicating with the interpreter and the imager to supply those ones of the image representations corresponding to selected document components of the processed documents (paragraph [0048], lines 1-10; **note that figure 1 shows the template storage 28 in communication with the image supplier 10**) and to receive selected image representations created by the imager during the processing of documents (paragraph [0054], lines 1-9; **note that a bit map gets generated for each variable data area and merged with the template, the page map is output for printing as shown at 29**).

Gauthier discloses all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components into composite of reusable document components; and said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document

Art Unit: 2625

components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays.

However, Brintzenhofe et al. disclose said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components into composite of reusable document components (**paragraph [0150], lines 1-13; note that it is disclosed how contents may be added to a composition and how each tree or component is changed accordingly. In figure 19, it is shown that the content m design and media trees before combining and after combining**); and said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays (**paragraph [0151], lines 1-11; note that it is disclosed that the components are combined with respect to the relative position i.e. empty text region**).

Gauthier and Brintzenhofe et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. presentation processing of document. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components into composite of reusable document components; and said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to efficiently utilize document combination and to have a system

Art Unit: 2625

that adapts the content to be able to fit a variety of media based upon changes to either the content or to the design (paragraph [0010], lines 1-4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gauthier and Brintzenhofe et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

Gauthier and Brintzenhofe et al. disclose most of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays.

However, Freund teaches said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays (**column 2, lines 32-44; note that a visual characteristics of the displayed link status indicator indicates whether or not the document represented by the Internet link is stored in the cache. If a user selects a link status indicator, the system and method will fetch the document associated with the corresponding Internet link and store it in the cache without displaying the document to the user**).

Gauthier, Brintzenhofe et al. and Freund are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. presentation processing of document. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document

Art Unit: 2625

components into composites of reusable underlays. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to efficiently utilize document combination and to have a system that adapts the content to be able to fit a variety of media based upon changes to either the content or to the design (paragraph [0010], lines 1-4, Brintzenhofe) and to allow a user to fetch a document and store it in the cache while the user is viewing another document (column 2, lines 42-44, Freund). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gauthier and Brintzenhofe et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

(2) regarding claim 9: Gauthier further disclose the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 8, further comprising a graphical user interface through which an associated user manages the reusable document component repository, the managing including selectively adjusting a repository storage size and selectively deleting image representations (**paragraph [0023], lines 1-5; note that the work station has display unit which displays the image**).

(3) regarding claim 10: Gauthier further disclose the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 8, further comprising a compressor that receives and compresses image representations created by the imager (**paragraph [0023], lines 1-8; note that the workstation 10 creates the image then the application program generates a specification of the image in PostScript**), and communicates the compressed image representations to the reusable document component repository

(paragraph [0024], lines 1-4; note that the PostScript interpreter is executed to generate a page map of the image).

(4) regarding claim 11: Gauthier further discloses the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 10, wherein the compressor is integrated into the imager **(paragraph [0024], lines 6-9; note that the postscript interpreter program gets initiated by the printer).**

(5) regarding claim 12: Gauthier further discloses the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 8, further comprising a random access memory cache communicating with the interpreter and the reusable document component repository **(28, figure 1, paragraph [0049], lines 7-9; note that the template file has been stored prior so that the merge task begins by accessing the file to retrieve the names of the template for the page),** the random access memory storing at least one most recently used image representation retrieved by the interpreter **(paragraph [0049], lines 9-10; note that the specified template gets retrieved).**

(6) regarding claim 13: Gauthier further discloses the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 8, further comprising a repository index that indexes image representations stored in the reusable document component repository, the repository

Art Unit: 2625

index communicating with the interpreter to identify images to be retrieved (**paragraph [0049], lines 2-4; note that the database is considered as the index repository**).

(7) regarding claim 14: Gauthier further discloses the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 13, further comprising a ping path between the interpreter and the reusable document component repository by which the interpreter pings the reusable document component repository responsive to the repository index indicating that a selected image representation is contained in the reusable document component repository (**paragraph [0051], lines 1-5; note that the merge task reads the data corresponding to the designated field name and it retrieves the graphics state**), the pinging directing the reusable document component repository not to delete of the selected image representation (**paragraph [0051], lines 5-9**).

(8) regarding claim 15: Gauthier further discloses the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 14, wherein the repository index is integrated into the page description language interpreter (**paragraph [0024], lines 3-4; note that the postscript interpreter creates a page map of the image**)

(9) regarding claim 16: Gauthier further disclose the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 8, further comprising a printing station that includes the page description language interpreter (**paragraph [0023], lines 1-8; note that an image**

Art Unit: 2625

containing text and graphics data is created a workstation), the imager (12, figure 1), and the reusable document component repository; and an electronic network by which the printing station receives documents for processing (paragraph [0024], lines 3-4; note that the postscript interpreter creates a page map of the image).

Claims 17-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauthier (US Publication Number 2004/0141197 A1) in view of Brintzenhofe et al. (US Publication Number 2005/0223320 A1).

(1) regarding claim 17: Gauthier further disclose a document construction method comprising:

receiving a document description including at least one selected reusable document component (**paragraph [0009], lines 1-8; note that a method for utilizing variable data with a page description language**);

querying a reusable document component repository containing stored image representations of reusable document components to locate a selected stored image representation corresponding to the selected reusable document component (**28, figure 1; paragraph [0047], lines 1-6; note that the template gets stored**);

conditional upon the querying,

identifying one of the stored image representations as corresponding to the selected reusable document component and retrieving the selected stored image

Art Unit: 2625

representation corresponding to the selected reusable document component

(paragraph [0048], lines 1-10; note that figure 1 shows the template storage 28 in communication with the image supplier 10), or,

not identifying one of the stored image representations as corresponding to the selected reusable document component, generating an image representation for the selected reusable document component, and storing the generated image representation in the reusable document component repository **(paragraph [0046], lines 11-13; note that if the attributes of the current graphics state differs from the attributes of previously reserved graphics, the control task generates another font cache); and**

converting the document description to a document image representation, the converting including incorporating the selected or generated image representation corresponding to the selected reusable document into the document image representation **(paragraph [0050], lines 1-5; note that the name corresponding to the first graphics state on the page, the merge accesses the merge file).**

Gauthier disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for some of said reusable document components into composite of reusable document components and combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays.

However, Brintzenhofe et al. disclose some of said reusable document components into composite of reusable document components (**paragraph [0150], lines 1-13; note that it is disclosed how contents may be added to a composition and how each tree or component is changed accordingly. In figure 19, it is shown that the content m design and media trees before combining and after combining**); and combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays (**paragraph [0151], lines 1-11; note that it is disclosed that the components are combined with respect to the relative position i.e. empty text region**).

Gauthier and Brintzenhofe et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. presentation processing of document. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art some of said reusable document components into composite of reusable document components and combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to efficiently utilize document combination and to have a system that adapts the content to be able to fit a variety of media based upon changes to either the content or to the design (paragraph [0010], lines 1-4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Brintzenhofe et al. with Gauthier to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

(2) regarding claim 18: Gauthier further disclose the document construction method as in claim 17, wherein the step of storing the generated image representation in the reusable document component repository includes associating a life span parameter with the generated image representation (**paragraph [0028], lines 1-3; note that a new attributed gets defined and placed on the top of the stack i.e. consider as the life-time stack**); and responsive to an expiration of the life span parameter, removing the corresponding generated image representation from the reusable document component repository (**paragraph [0028], lines 3-7; note that the old attribute gets deleted**).

(3) regarding claim 19: Gauthier further disclose the document construction method as in claim 18, wherein the step of associating a life span parameter with the generated rasterized image includes associating one of a temporal life span and an indication of permanence with the generated image representation (**paragraph [0044], lines 1-6**).

(4) regarding claim 20: Gauthier further disclose the document construction method as in claim 18, wherein the life span parameter is such that the generated image representation remains available in the reusable document component repository for reuse in the construction of subsequent documents (**paragraph [0045], lines 1-10**).

(5) regarding claim 21: Gauthier further disclose the document construction method as in claim 17, responsive to a selected user input, further comprising removing the generated image representation from the reusable document component repository **(paragraph [0028], lines 3-7).**

(6) regarding claim 22: Gauthier further discloses the document construction method as in claim 17, wherein the querying includes tracking previously generated image representations **(paragraph [0031], lines 1-7)**; and conditional upon the tracking indicating that a previously generated image representation corresponds to the selected reusable document component, verifying the previously generated image representation currently resides in the reusable document component repository **(paragraph [0032], lines 1-14).**

(7) regarding claim 23: Gauthier further discloses the document construction method as in claim 22, wherein the querying further includes conditional upon a successful verifying, marking the previously generated image representation to prevent a removing thereof **(paragraph [0049], lines 7-9; note that the template file has been stored prior so that the merge task begins by accessing the file to retrieve the names of the template for the page).**

(8) regarding claim 24: Gauthier further discloses the document construction method as in claim 17, wherein the storing of the generated image representation in the reusable document component repository includes, prior to the storing, compressing the image (**paragraph [0023], lines 1-8; note that the workstation 10 creates the image then the application program generates a specification of the image in PostScript).**

(9) regarding claim 25: Gauthier further discloses the document construction method as in claim 17, further comprising storing at least a portion of the reusable document component repository in a random access memory cache (**28, figure 1, paragraph [0049], lines 7-9; note that the template file has been stored prior so that the merge task begins by accessing the file to retrieve the names of the template for the page).**

(10) regarding claim 26: Gauthier further discloses the document construction method as in claim 17, further comprising storing the reusable document component repository on a permanent storage device; and storing most recently accessed image representations in a random access memory cache (**paragraph [0049], lines 2-10).**

(11) regarding claim 27: Gauthier further disclose the document construction method as in claim 17, further comprising identifying the selected reusable document

component as reusable by detecting a reusable document component hint associated with the reusable document component (**paragraph [0046], lines 7-16; note that the variable data is linked with the cached font so that it identifies if the data is corresponding**).

Claims 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauthier (US Publication Number 2004/0141197 A1), Brintzenhofe et al. (US Publication Number 2005/0223320 A1) and McBrearty et al. (US Patent Number 6,744,452 B1) as applied to claim 17, and further in view of Seseck et al. (US Publication Number 2003/0086098).

(1) regarding claim 28: Gauthier and Brintzenhofe et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching wherein the document description is encoded in a Variable data Intelligent Postscript Printware language.

However, Seseck et al. disclose wherein the document description is encoded in a Variable data Intelligent Postscript Printware language (**paragraph 30, lines 1-7**).

Gauthier, Brintzenhofe et al. and Seseck et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. presentation processing of document. Gauthier, Brintzenhofe et al. and Seseck et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. presentation processing of document and printing processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in

Art Unit: 2625

the art wherein the document description is encoded in a Variable data Intelligent Postscript Printware language. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been so that it would be efficiently process the variable data to the printer ready format (paragraph [0003], lines 12-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gauthier, Brintzenhofe et al. with Seseck et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 28.

(2) regarding claim 29: Gauthier and Brintzenhofe et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching wherein the document description is encoded in a Personalized Print Markup Language.

However, Seseck et al. disclose wherein the document description is encoded in a Personalized Print Markup Language (**paragraph 19, lines 12-17**).

Gauthier, Brintzenhofe et al. and Seseck et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. presentation processing of document. Gauthier, Brintzenhofe et al. and Seseck et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. presentation processing of document and printing processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art wherein the document description is encoded in a Personalized Print Markup Language. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been so that it would be efficiently process the variable data to the printer ready format (paragraph [0003], lines

12-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gauthier, Brintzenhofe et al. with Seseck et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 29.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant, on pages 13 and 18, argues that neither Brintzenhofe et al. nor McBrearty et al. disclosed “obtaining a list of document components associated with an interpreted page cacheable reusable, the list of document components including cacheable reusable document components and non-cached document components associated with the interpreted page; and/or identifying the cacheable reusable document components included in the obtained list of documents components associated with the interpreted page.”

In response: Appellant’s assertions are incorrect. Brintzenhofe et al. in paragraph [0086], lines 1-6; note that a composite document with different types of components is discloses , such composite document has cacheable reusable components such as forms also see figures 4A-6, the list, associated with an interpreted page cacheable reusable, of document components including cacheable reusable document components is disclsoed. Also, in paragraph [0086], lines 3-9; note that the cacheable reusable document is identified as the file, identifying the cacheable reusable document components included in the obtained list of documents components associated the interpreted page. And McBrearty et al. teaches in figure 5, column 9, lines 28-34; a web page is requested or obtained from a server and a check is made to determine if non cached components are present, obtaining a list of document components and non-

cached document components associated with the interpreted page. The rejection of this limitation is based on a combination of the two references and it is not necessary for one reference to teach the whole paragraph. Therefore, the Examiner relies upon the teachings of Brintzenhofe et al. and McBrearty et al. for rebutting of appellants' stated argument.

Appellant, on page 15, argues that neither Brintzenhofe et al. nor McBrearty et al. disclosed "caching, to form a composite reusable underlay, a combination of identified cacheable reusable document components rendered, relative to each identified cacheable reusable document component in the combination, to a full page size"

In response: Appellant's assertions are incorrect. Brintzenhofe et al. in paragraph [0133], lines 1-24 disclosed the cached component such as bass products has a combination of other reusable components in order to render/form a full page size as also shown in figure 8-9. Examiner relies upon the teachings of Brintzenhofe et al. for rebutting of appellants' stated argument.

Appellant, on page 20, argues that neither Brintzenhofe et al. nor McBrearty et al. disclosed caching each identified cacheable reusable document component rendered to each identified cacheable reusable document component's respective bounding box dimensions.

In response: Appellant's assertions are incorrect. Brintzenhofe et al. in figure 9 and paragraph [0134], lines 1-8 and [0135], lines 1-17 disclosed cached reusable components such as form are rendered and the composite combination i.e. the contents of each elements are bounded in the combination of the particular page. Examiner relies upon the teachings of Brintzenhofe et al. for rebutting of appellants' stated argument.

Appellant, on page 21, argues that neither Brintzenhofe et al. nor McBrearty et al. disclosed caching a composite combination of a set of identified cacheable reusable document components rendered, relative to each identified cacheable reusable document component in the composite combination, in a bounding box of sufficient size to adequately contain the composite combination.

In response: Appellant's assertions are incorrect. Brintzenhofe et al. in figure 9 and paragraph [0100], lines 1-6; note that within the component there are subcomponents which also get rendered to fit content to layout as explained in paragraph [0111], lines 7-11. Also, paragraph [0134], lines 1-8 and [0135], lines 1-17 disclosed cached reusable components such as form are rendered and the composite combination i.e. the contents of each elements are bounded in the combination of the particular page. Examiner relies upon the teachings of Brintzenhofe et al. for rebutting of appellants' stated argument.

Appellant, on page 24, argues that neither Gauthier nor McBrearty et al. disclosed assessing the rendered page for the possibility of having an underlay-overlay pair.

In response: Appellant's assertions are incorrect. McBrearty et al. in figure 5, column 9, lines 28-34; disclosed a web page is requested or obtained from a server and a check is made to determine if non cached components are present, per specification underlay-overlay implies cached and non-cached components, abstract. The interpretation of McBrearty is taken under consideration based on the defined concept of the claim in the specification. Examiner relies upon the teachings of McBrearty et al. for rebutting of appellants' stated argument.

Appellant, on page 29, argues that neither Brintzenhofe et al. and Freund nor Gauthier disclosed a page description language interpreter that combines some of the reusable document components into composites of reusable document components and combines some of the reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of the reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays.

In response: Appellant's assertions are incorrect. Brintzenhofe et al. disclose said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components into composite of reusable document components paragraph [0150], lines 1-13; note that it is disclosed how contents may be added to a composition and how each tree or component is changed accordingly. In figure 19, it is shown that the content

Art Unit: 2625

m design and media trees before combining and after combining; and said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays paragraph [0151], lines 1-11; note that it is disclosed that the components are combined with respect to the relative position i.e. empty text region. Also, *Freund teaches said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays* column 2, lines 32-44; note that a visual characteristics of the displayed link status indicator indicates whether or not the document represented by the Internet link is stored in the cache. If a user selects a link status indicator, the system and method will fetch the document associated with the corresponding Internet link and store it in the cache without displaying the document to the user. Per specification underlay-overlay implies cached and non-cached components, abstract. Examiner relies upon the teachings of Brintzenhofe et al. and Freund for rebutting of appellants' stated argument.

Appellant, on page 30, argues that neither Brintzenhofe et al. and Freund nor Gauthier disclosed a repository index that indexes image representations stored in the reusable document component repository, the repository index communicating with the interpreter to identify images to be retrieved.

In response: Appellant's assertions are incorrect. Gauthier in paragraph [0049], lines 2-10 disclosed having a database that is able to store the templates, i.e.

Art Unit: 2625

considered as the index image repository of font caches and graphics and the merger is able to access the merge files to retrieve the name of the template from the page and in order to form a merge task. Examiner relies upon the teachings of Gauthier for rebutting of appellants' stated argument.

Appellant, on page 32, argues that neither Brintzenhofe et al. and Freund nor Gauthier disclosed a ping path between the interpreter and the reusable document component repository by which the interpreter pings the reusable document component repository responsive to the repository index indicating that a selected image representation is contained in the reusable document component repository, the pinging directing the reusable document component repository not to delete of the selected image representation.

In response: Appellant's assertions are incorrect. Gauthier in paragraph [0051], lines 2-10 disclosed after the merge task has read the data corresponding to the designated field name, it retrieves the graphics state which was reserved under the same name i.e. pinging the between the interpreter and the reusable document repository, as well as the character bit maps which are linked to that graphics state. The merge task then generates a bit map of the data in accordance with the graphics state attributes. After the bit map is generated, it is merged into the template at the region corresponding to the graphics state, by writing the data bit map over the existing template bit map i.e. not deleted. Examiner relies upon the teachings of Gauthier for rebutting of appellants' stated argument.

Appellant, on pages 34 and 36, argues that either Brintzenhofe et al. or Gauthier disclosed disclosing combining some of the reusable document components into composites of reusable document components and combining some of the reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of the reusable document components into composites of reusable underlay.

In response: Appellant's assertions are incorrect. Brintzenhofe et al. disclosed paragraph [0150], lines 1-13; how contents may be added to a composition and how each tree or component is changed accordingly. In figure 19, it is shown that the content in design and media trees before combining and after combining. Also, in paragraph [0151], lines 1-11; note that it is disclosed that the components are combined with respect to the relative position i.e. empty text region. It is also, incorrect to assume that Examiner has inconsistency of the position. In the previous argument, Brintzenhofe et al. did not specifically disclose *page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays*. Examiner relies upon the teachings of Brintzenhofe et al. for rebutting of appellants' stated argument.

Appellant, on page 38, argues that neither Brintzenhofe et al. and Freund nor Gauthier disclosed storing of the generated image representation in the reusable document component repository includes associating a life span parameter with the

Art Unit: 2625

generated image representation; and responsive to an expiration of the life span parameter, removing the corresponding generated image representation from the reusable document component repository.

In response: Appellant's assertions are incorrect. Gauthier in paragraph [0028], lines 1-3; disclose paragraph [0028], lines 1-3; note that a new attributed gets defined and placed on the top of the stack i.e. consider as the life-time stack; and responsive to an expiration of the life span parameter, removing the corresponding generated image representation from the reusable document component repository, paragraph [0028], lines 3-7; note that when an attribute is deleted, it is removed from the stack. The combination of all of the attributes located in the stack at any point during the execution of the PostScript interpreter constitutes graphics state for the page. Examiner relies upon the teachings of Gauthier for rebutting of appellants' stated argument.

Appellant, on page 40, argues that neither Brintzenhofe et al. and Freund nor Gauthier disclosed the associating of the life span parameter with the generated rasterized image includes associating one of a temporal life span and an indication of permanence with the generated image representation.

In response: Appellant's assertions are incorrect. Gauthier in paragraph [0044], lines 1-6 disclosed the control task is triggered to reserve a graphics state, the above listed attributes, if specified, are combined with the PostScript attributes from the stack, and reserved as a single graphics state under the name obtained from the PostScript

file. The name obtained is considered as the temporal life span and an indication of the permanence with the generated image representation. Examiner relies upon the teachings of Gauthier for rebutting of appellants' stated argument.

Appellant, on page 42, argues that neither Brintzenhofe et al. and Freund nor Gauthier disclosed the life span parameter is such that the generated image representation remains available in the reusable document component repository for reuse in the construction of subsequent documents.

In response: Appellant's assertions are incorrect. Gauthier in paragraph [0045], lines 1-10 disclosed after the interpreter is resumed, it continues defining graphics state attributes for the page, until the control task detects another print command. Upon detecting another print command, the control task again interrupts execution of the interpreter, and determines whether the data in the PostScript file corresponds to a variable data area. If the data corresponds to a variable data area, the control task again substitutes a graphics state name from the job file for the data in the PostScript file, and reads the graphics state attributes from the stack and job file. Examiner relies upon the teachings of Gauthier for rebutting of appellants' stated argument.

Appellant, on page 43, argues that neither Brintzenhofe et al. and Freund nor Gauthier disclosed the querying includes tracking previously generated image representations; and conditional upon the tracking indicating that a previously generated

Art Unit: 2625

image representation corresponds to the selected reusable document component, verifying the previously generated image representation currently resides in the reusable document component repository.

In response: Appellant's assertions are incorrect. Gauthier in paragraph [0031], lines 1-4; note that the graphics state name corresponding to the data area is defined directly within the PostScript file 11, by making the name part of the image that is created in the application program. Also, in paragraph [0032], If the control task determines that the data corresponds to a variable area i.e. previously generated image representation, it reads the current contents of the graphics state stack to determine the attributes to be used for printing data in that area. In addition to the PostScript attributes specified in the stack, the graphics state can also include attributes which are specifically tailored to variable data printing. Examiner relies upon the teachings of Gauthier for rebutting of appellants' stated argument.

Appellant, on page 45, argues that neither Brintzenhofe et al. and Freund nor Gauthier disclosed the querying includes, conditional upon a successful verifying, marking the previously generated image representation to prevent a removing thereof.

In response: Appellant's assertions are incorrect. Gauthier in paragraph [0049], lines 7-9, note that the template file has been stored prior so that the merge task begins by accessing the file to retrieve the names of the template for the page i.e. conditional upon a successful verifying, marking the previously generated image representation to

Art Unit: 2625

prevent a removing thereof. Examiner relies upon the teachings of Gauthier for rebutting of appellants' stated argument.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hilina S Kassa/

Examiner, Art Unit 2625

August 27, 2010

Conferees:

/Twyler L. Haskins/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/King Y. Poon/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

